

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_95350
Title of the Manuscript:	ACUTE TOXICITY AND IN VIVO ANTIOXIDANT ACTIVITY EVALUATION OF AQUEOUS EXTRACTS FROM PHYLLANTHUS ODONTADENIUS Müll. Arg.
Type of the Article	

### General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy> )

### PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments  <b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  <b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  <b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  <b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  <b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  <b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	<b>1. Yes, I think it is relevant.</b>  <b>2. It's a little bit longer, but it describes the whole experiment.</b>  <b>3. Yes.</b>  <b>4. Yes.</b>  <b>5. Yes.</b>  <b>6. Yes.</b>	
<b>Minor REVISION</b> comments <b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	It's an excellent language quality.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Congratulations on a very well-written and detailed article. My only criticism is that the results, discussion, and conclusion should be shorter. I recommend publishing the article after optimization!	

### PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Tsvetan Trichkov
Department, University & Country	Military Medical Academy, Bulgaria